THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I. JULY, 1921. No. 7.

Withdrawal from the Church in Germany.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

Physical suffering and political degradation, though they are very acute and prove extremely distressing to millions of her inhabitants, are not the most grievous affliction of present-day Germany. A wide-spread spiritual and moral decay is being revealed in that country, which causes its present humiliation to appear immeasurably worse than the one after the appalling ravages of the Thirty Years' War. On the spiritual downfall of the Church in Germany we offer here a collection of facts from a writer who evidently has made a fairly thorough study of the situation. Germany's moral debacle, especially as regards ethics of sex, we shall present in a later article.

I. HISTORICAL FACTS.

An ominous symptom of spiritual decadence and decay is the organized movement for abandoning the Church, which has been given a fresh momentum by the revolution of 1919. The movement has already produced a special literature.[1] Dr. R. Lempp, of Stuttgart, in the *Monatsschrift fuer Pastoraltheologie*[2] offers a very informing article on this movement since the war, upon which we draw in this paper.

1) See *Violet*, Der Stand der Kirchenaustrittsbewegung am Ende des Jahres 1919 (Status of the Movement Away from the Church at the End of 1919); *Kirchner*, Aufsaetze (articles) in the *Christliche Welt*, 1920, Nr. 1 ff.; *Schubert*, Aufsaetze in the *Volkskirche*, 1920, Nr. 1 ff.; *Schneider*, Kirchenuebertritte und -austritte im letzten Jahrzehnt (Joining and Withdrawing from the Church during the Last Decade). The *Evangelical Press Association* has published a handbook for the study of this movement, *Der Kampf gegen die Kirche* (The Fight against the Church), and the *Press Association of Saxony* has issued a *Handbuch zum Kirchenaustritt* (Handbook for the Movement of Withdrawal from the Church).

2) December, 1920, pp. 49—59.

Withdrawal from the Church is regarded by Dr. Lempp as a declaration of irreligion. The statistics for such withdrawals during 1920 are not yet completed, but it is certain that the number will exceed 100,000. Two similar waves swept over Germany in 1908/09 and in 1913/14, at the very beginning of the war. The sum total of those who left the Church and became "Konfessionslose" in those two instances was 212,000. There is no sign that the movement has been checked, but German churchmen expect it to grow because of the increase of the taxes for the state churches, which a powerful party in Germany seems determined to continue. It does not seem to enter the minds of these churchmen that the withdrawals which they are watching with a dismay bordering on despair may not mean — in some instances surely they do not mean — withdrawal from religion, but from state-control of religion. In every instance where they are such, they would be a sign of returning spiritual health; but as a matter of fact such instances are not numerous.

For three generations organizations of freethinkers have existed in Germany. During the first great movement away from the Church in 1845/48 the *Alliance of Free Religious Congregations of Germany* [3] was formed. This body still numbers 14,000 members in 60 congregations. Their founder was Rupp, and his spirit is said to have been best preserved by the congregation of Koenigsberg. The development of this body has been towards absolute radicalism, predominantly with a materialistic tendency. It is only a question of time when they will be merged in the Alliance of Freethinkers; [4] for they already share with this latter society its president, Reverend Tschirm of Wiesbaden, and its official organ, *Der Freidenker,* edited by Bruno Wille. Individual members and some of the Free Religious Congregations still assert that they differ from the Freethinkers, because they want to be *religious,* while free from dogma; because their preachers conduct devotional exercises, and deliver religious addresses at consecrations of young people,[5] marriages, and funerals. But the characteristic spirit of these congregations was glaringly displayed in 1914, when the Free Religious Congregation of Berlin, under the leadership of Adolf Hoffmann, conducted its revolting "May Festival of the Godless," [6] at which everything sacred was treated with scorn.

3) "Bund freier religioeser Gemeinden Deutschlands."

4) See next paragraph.

5) "Jugendweihen"; a substitute for the Christian rite of confirmation.

6) "Maifest der Gottlosen."

In 1881 the notorious materialist Prof. Buechner organized the *German Alliance of Freethinkers,*[7]) as a branch of an international organization of like tendencies. The immediate object was to unite the scattered freethinkers of Germany, and the aim, to liberate mankind from its religious and scientific prejudices, which meant, that a campaign of popular education for the naturalism of the Buechner and Haeckel type was begun. At the International Congress of Freethinkers at Rome in 1904 Prof. Haeckel marched at the head of 8,000 freethinkers. In 1905, at the congress in Paris, a procession of 100,000 paraded in the streets of the French capital. In Germany the Alliance has as yet made no such formidable demonstrations; in 1914 it numbered 6,000 members.

In 1906 the German *Alliance of Monists*[8]) was organized, under the protectorate of Haeckel. Its honorary president is the well-known chemist Ostwald, its president Prof. H. Schmidt in Jena, the former assistant of Haeckel. Prior to the war this society was the leading factor in the movement for withdrawal from the Church. The propaganda of the Monists differs from that of the freethinkers: the latter aimed at educating the masses by popular methods in naturalistic thought, the former aim at a scientific system for a modern, uniform, purely secular conception of life,[9]) in contrast with the other-worldliness of Christianity that is based on faith and revelation. The Monists are divided into materialistic Monists, at present the dominant faction, and idealistic Monists, with the pantheistic metaphysician Prof. Arthur Drews as their chief spokesman. In his exhaustive treatise in two volumes, *Der Monismus,* Prof. Drews exposes the great differences existing within the Alliance of Monists. The Alliance numbers about 5,000 members. While not demanding of its members directly that they withdraw from the Church, a great part of the Alliance is engaged in anti-Church propaganda, and is supplied with powerful means for their purpose. They advocate the secularization of the primary school, the introduction of instruction in morality instead of religion, and similar practical measures. Their organ is *Monistische Monatshefte;* for their young people they publish a periodical, called *Sonne* (*The Sun*).

Since 1908 the Socialist freethinkers, acting upon their class consciousness, have united in a separate organization under the

7) Der Deutsche Freidenkerbund. 8) Der Deutsche Monistenbund.
9) "rein diesseitige Weltanschauung."

leadership of Menke, a member of the Saxon Diet and aligned with the U. S. P.[10] Their society is known as the *Central Association of Proletarian Freethinkers.*[11] With them the fight against the Church is merely a phase of their revolutionary class conflict. Their organ is *Der Atheist* (*The Atheist*).

In 1911 the Alliance of Monists created a working committee of eight men, known as *"Komitee Konfessionslos,"* [12] for the purpose of inducing wholesale withdrawals from the Church. The chairman of the committee was Prof. Gurlitt of Munich; he was followed by Drews of Karlsruhe. The agent of the committee is Lehmann of Russbueldt, a man whose hatred of the Church can hardly be surpassed. His cheap [13] brochure, *The Spiritual Fight for Liberty by Withdrawal from the Church,"* was sold in immense quantities. The closing sentence of the brochure reads: "The name 'Christianity' soon must mean for our people nothing more than a reminiscence of a period of grievous sickness." This "Komitee Konfessionslos" works through confidential agents in all large cities of Germany; it keeps up a vigorous agitation by means of a newspaper correspondence in which facts are grossly misrepresented, by maintaining bureaus of information and aid to those who wish to withdraw from the Church, by disseminating pamphlets, and by organizing riotous mass-meetings at which high school professors from the Alliance of Monists clasp hands with the most radical leaders of the Social Democracy. It was this committee that conducted the great movement for withdrawal from the Church in 1913/14. Several Socialist dailies, led by *Vorwaerts* and *Die Welt am Montag* (*The World on Monday*), are entirely controlled by this committee. Nevertheless, the convention of the Social Democratic Party at Jena declared the agitation for withdrawal from the Church a private affair of "Komitee Konfessionslos," and the agitation was denounced by a number of Reform Socialists and by serious minds like the freethinker Rudolf Penzig, the president of the Society for Ethical Culture.

All who have withdrawn from the Church are to be gathered into the *Alliance of Non-Confessionalists,*[14] which was organized

---

10) "Unabhaengige Sozialistische Partei" (Independent Socialist Party).

11) "Zentralverband proletarischer Freidenker."

12) Committee for Non-confessionalism.

13) Sold for 10 pfennig.

14) "Bund der Konfessionslosen."

in 1913, with the Jewish physician Dr. Zepler of Berlin as president. Its organ, *Der Weg* (*The Way*), attacks and reviles in the most trenchant form imaginable every religion and religious society, also the Christian views regarding marriage, free love, abortion, etc.

II. Characteristics of the Movement.

Dr. Lempp points out furthermore that the evolution since the war of this movement away from the Church exhibits a number of characteristic differences when compared with previous stages of the movement. Since 1916 pamphlets hostile to the Church began to reach the soldiers at the battle-fronts. At the same time withdrawals from the Church in their home districts were reported to the soldiers. Among the leaders of the movement quarrels broke out during the war because of differences of opinion on national issues. Moreover, the Naturalists began an energetic opposition to *Prof. Drews,* who declared publicly that withdrawal from the Church was plainly harmful as long as the parties withdrawing were not aided towards a new and intelligible faith. Accordingly, Drews, on the basis of his pantheistic-idealistic philosophy, proposed a new creed, in which God, the world, and man are confessed. Lastly, *Rev. Maurenbrecher,* of the Free Religious Society at Mannheim, one of the most effective speakers during the movement for withdrawal from the Church in 1913/14, not only returned to the Church, but also accepted the pastorate of a Reformed church at Dresden, and confessed publicly in his initial sermon that he had been brought back by the sorrows of the times to the knowledge of the truth of the Christian faith. He declared it to be impossible to find any sense in living in secularism;[15] for all its phenomena terminate in death. He professed that the grace of God had faced him about towards new faith in God, and that in his godless state he had ever been inwardly unhappy. Rev. Wolsdorf of the Free Religious Society in Nuremberg also returned to the Church.

The longer the war continued and the more disappointments it caused, the stronger doubt grew in the justice and goodness of God; and the more numerous charges were raised against the Church because it sanctioned the war, the plainer it became that after the termination of the war the enemies of the Church would become very aggressive. They were the first to be placed at the head of affairs by the *revolution.* Nearly all the ministers of cultus

15) "aus dem Diesseits."

of the German republic during the first period after the revolution were irreligious; some of them were leaders of the enemies of the Church; chief among them was Adolf Hoffmann in Prussia. In most of the states the majority of the ministers had no confessional alignment whatever; so also the German chancellor Scheidemann. President Ebert is a Catholic. Fortunately for the Church the earliest measures of the government against the Church, particularly in Prussia, next in Hamburg, Gotha, Brunswick, and elsewhere, were quite clumsy, and caused a reaction in circles friendly to the Church, both among the evangelical and the Catholic party, which wrecked the plans of radical enemies of the Church. The new constitution of the German Empire conceded to the churches the status of public corporations, placed religious instruction as a regular branch of study on the schedules of the state schools, confirmed the theological faculties as an integral part of the universities, and in general afforded the Church freedom of operation. In the national and in the state governments the Centrist party [16] rapidly became the determining factor. *As a result of this unlooked-for consequence of the revolution freethinking societies were seized with a veritable rage.* Directly connected with their furious disgust was *the mighty swelling of the tide which is now carrying people out of the Church.* It began about the spring of 1919. In 1920 *Der Weg* wrote: "A worse swindle than this so-called separation of Church and State has never been enacted. Our reply must be: Withdrawal from the Church *en masse.*" In most of the German constituencies the revolution has greatly facilitated withdrawal from the Church: the fee for withdrawal has been abolished; nobody is any longer obliged to report his withdrawal to his pastor, even youths fourteen years old may declare their withdrawal without the consent of the parents; the former rule which obligated the party withdrawing to pay the church-tax for the entire current year has been changed by reducing the obligation to three months; the four weeks which formerly had to intervene between the declaration of intention to withdraw and the actual withdrawal have been abolished. All these factors have been favorable to the movement for quitting the Church. The movement was headed again by the "Komitee Konfessionslos" and the Alliance of Non-Confessionalists, which in politics is running completely in the wake of the U. S. P. Already during the war Dr. Zepler published a confidential correspondence which he called

16) Roman Catholic.

"Post Bellum." In this publication he expressed the firm conviction that the "clerical war usury," the "moldering mass of religious sentiments," would soon come to an end, and that then his time for acting would come. The Berlin suburb Neukoelln became the headquarters for this movement; in its town-hall the Laborers' Council established a bureau of information for persons contemplating withdrawal from the Church.

A principal distinction between the present movement for withdrawal as compared with former movements is furnished by the greater intensity of political contrasts in the present movement. This is seen especially in the split that has occurred in the Social Democratic Party. The U. S. P., as a party, has quite openly espoused agitation for withdrawal from the Church. *The movement is backed* not only by the Central Alliance of Proletarian Freethinkers, but *by the entire press of the U. S. P.* Religion is to these men no longer a private affair. At the communal elections in Berlin and other places the slogan was issued: Only candidates that have withdrawn from the Church can be placed on the ticket of the U. S. P. This slogan leaves the question undecided whether Jews, too, are excluded from candidacy. This propaganda of the U. S. P. has met with very great success — essentially greater than that which the party scored during 1913, the worst year in previous movements. During 1919 the number of withdrawals was 41,438 in Berlin, 37,914 in the district of Potsdam, 7,000 in the city of Hannover, to which number 1,500 more were added during the first fourteen days in 1920. The withdrawals in Hamburg during the first half of 1919 amounted to more than 4,000. Similar successes are reported from Duesseldorf, Dresden, Anhalt, Gera. In the villages in Thuringia the number of withdrawals reached 20 per cent. of the population. For the Catholic Church the average of the losses is lower among the rural population, but in some of the industrial centers it is rather greater than that of the Evangelical Church. The overwhelming majority of the persons withdrawing are members of the U. S. P. or of the K. P. D.[17] The hatred in these circles of everything that bears the name of the Church or of Christianity has become boundless through the war and the disappointing results of the revolution. A meeting had been called by Christian groups at Circus Busch. The object was to protest against the appointment of Dr. Loewenstein as school superintendent of Berlin. The meeting was frustrated by radicals.

17) "Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands." (?)

The scenes enacted on this occasion surpassed in wild, blasphemous animosity anything that happened at the worst meetings under Liebknecht and Adolf Hoffmann on the Day of Prayer and Penitence in 1913. It is certain that in these radical parties the movement for withdrawal from the Church will continue. It is even possible that these parties will make an attempt to make withdrawal from the Church obligatory on all their members. Dr. Lempp thinks that, if this is done, the idea of the national church (Volkskirche) would be shattered in the industrial cities and in the suburbs. This might prove a blessing in disguise. At any rate, while we have not one word to say in defense of the frenzied antagonism of these parties to the Church, we cannot share this particular alarm of Dr. Lempp, because to our mind the *Volkskirche* in Germany, or anywhere else, will always be an "Unding," — a spiritual abnormity. As a peculiar feature of the U. S. P. propaganda Dr. Lempp notes the activity of one of its members, the Solingen pastor *Dr. Lic. Hartmann:* he has, through the public press, addressed an ultimatum, with a specified time limit, to the Prussian Church, in which he declares that, unless the Church becomes completely democratized, desists from all enforcement of dogma,[18] and enters upon a relentless war against mammon, he will inaugurate wholesale withdrawals from the Church.

However, the violent agitation for withdrawal on the part of radical Socialists *has caused consternation among enemies of the Church in the political parties that recruit themselves from the bourgeoisie and among the Majority Socialists,* and this is another significant feature of the movement for withdrawal. During political campaigns and in their work on the new constitution the bourgeoisie parties are eager to manifest their friendly attitude to the Church to a degree that would have been unbelievable formerly among the liberal parties. The Majority Social Democrats lay great stress on the old tenet voiced in the Erfurt program: Religion is a private affair, and several of their leaders have in their public addresses spoken in a tone friendly to the Church. Haenisch, the minister of cultus, in a speech at Maria Laach,[19] acknowledged the valuable service which the Church has rendered in the cause of popular education. Members of the Diet like Keil, Meerfeld, Radbruch, have strongly asserted that, when once the Church is no longer a state church, the hostile relation between the Church and the Social Democracy must cease. Undersecretary of State

18) Dogmenzwang. 19) A strong Roman Catholic center.

Schultz has declared it to be a duty of Christian Socialists who remain in the Church to take part in the work of the Church. The president of the Wuerttemberg Diet, Keil of Stuttgart, has administered a sharp rebuke in the *Schwaebische Tagwacht* to a college professor, the Social Democrat Sackmann, who had declared cooperation of Social Democrats in the work of the Church impossible. This does not mean, of course, that the Majority Socialists and their individual members have become friendly to the Church, but it reveals a plain effort on their part to reduce to practise the principle: Religion is a private affair, and the Majority Socialists for this reason maintain an attitude of manifest reserve over and against the propaganda for withdrawal. Even Preuss, who prior to the war was one of the leading agitators for withdrawal, has completely retired from the movement, and at the congress of Monists last year forced through an adverse vote on the motion that withdrawal from the Church be made obligatory on the members of the Alliance of Monists. Towards the same end operate the swinging over to the Majority Socialists of a number of pastors in Berlin, Saxony, and other localities, and the starting of organizations composed of Socialists friendly to the Church.

But when we say that it is chiefly the radical Socialist parties that are identified with the present movement for withdrawal, that does not mean that the *Monists and freethinkers,* the bulk of whose membership is among the bourgeoisie and the Majority Socialists, have stopped their activity. True, the Weimar Federation,[20] which since 1907 sought to amalgamate all societies of freethinkers, has been dissolved, but the individual organizations which belonged to this Federation have recently become very active again. Immediately after the revolution the Executive Board of the Alliance of Monists believed that in the new state the Monists would occupy the position formerly held by the Church. When this hope was not realized, the Monists felt greatly disappointed and resolved to start *a more vigorous propaganda* for withdrawal. At the congress of Monists in Hannover in 1919, and at that of the Freethinkers and Free Religionists in Leipzig in 1920, strong pleas were made for the necessity of a union among these three bodies, but the union movement was frustrated again and again by personal issues. The difference between now and 1913/14 is seen in the fact that at present it is the Proletarian Freethinkers that

20) das Weimarer Kartell.

refuse cooperation. In certain localities the free-religious factions have to a great extent become federated, *e. g.,* in Berlin in the "great Federation for Kultur," [21] likewise in Munich and Stuttgart. In Stuttgart the freethinkers and the Monists conduct a joint organ, joint educational endeavors for the young, and nearly always joint meetings. The Alliance of Monists embraces the more refined and better educated elements, while the Alliance of Freethinkers is composed of the common people. The Monists furnish the leadership for the entire movement for withdrawal, as far as it is non-political and results from long cherished radical tendencies. Recently the Alliance of Monists has gained a great number of adherents among the *teachers,* and to a certain extent even among students. Upon the whole, however, the movement for withdrawal among the bourgeoisie and the Majority Socialists lacks great drawing power: the enemies of the Church from the proletariat do not attend their meetings, and a great part of the bourgeoisie and the Majority Socialists no longer favor the movement for withdrawal from the Church.

III. Motives of the Movement.

The propelling thoughts back of the movement, to begin with, may be said to be the same as in former years. Naturally. Still there are some modifications. Two different currents are flowing into each other. One starts in the *natural sciences.* It combats the Christian faith on the ground that it is irreconcilable with the modern view of the world. "The religion of Monism proposes in the spirit of Goethe to supplant the dying supernatural faith of the dualistic religions, by teaching the oneness of the God-nature,[22] and basing its teaching on the known facts of natural science, not on revelations that have become fixed in dogmas." [23] From this vantage-ground attacks are made on the Biblical accounts of miracles, and these accounts are ridiculed. Teachers are being heckled for telling the children the Biblical account of creation, thus forcing upon the children from the very start an irreconcilable inner discord with what they hear and learn later in geology. At present it is chiefly the *war* that is dragged in for the purpose of showing the senselessness of faith in a kind Father in heaven who directs

21) das grosse Kulturkartell.

22) die Einheit der Gottnatur. The idea is, that God and the created universe are one (Monism), not two (Dualism).

23) Manifesto of the Alliance of Monists at Stuttgart, October, 1919.

the life of individuals and answers prayer. Moreover, especially sharp attacks are made on *Christian ethics.* It is said to be heteronomous,[24] founded on faith in retribution, and therefore, of inferior value. The chief objection, however, is, that many who in later life lose the faith of their early years lose at the same time their good morals, because in their early Christian training they were directed to base their morals entirely on the divine commandments and the divine retribution. Dr. Lempp thinks that this objection — to which attention has been called occasionally also by a Christian pedagog like Fr. William Foerster — is not to be lightly set aside. Certainly not; but has the objection to Christian training been correctly stated in the foregoing? Teaching children divine commandments and the law of retribution does not differ essentially from inculcating upon them the precepts of natural religion. It is not Christian ethics at all, but the moral philosophy of the natural man expressed in Bible terms; and the Church that teaches it does not deserve the designation "evangelical." Nor will the German Church win the favor of its critics by a return to Gospel ethics. For her critics charge that the appalling lack of the moral sense which one witnesses in the present generation is due to the fact that the youths of these days have not been given a training in morals independent of religion and based on empirical science. The Central Society of Proletarian Freethinkers has spread its pamphlet *Get out of the Church!* [25] in many hundreds of thousands of copies. In this pamphlet it is claimed that out of 100,000 persons 1,443 Catholics and 1,094 Evangelicals violated the penal laws in 1910, while of professed non-religionists only 561 were guilty of such offenses. Dr. Lempp declares this piece of statistics utterly at variance with the facts in the case. He says that it was obtained by numbering with the "Konfessionslose" (persons professing no connection with any church) the members of sectarian bodies, which were quite numerous even in 1910. Particularly sharp attacks are made on *religious* instruction and the Christian school. When the question of retaining these features in the constitution of the Empire was debated, very great bitterness was manifested. Another pamphlet that is being circulated bears the inscription: *For the Sake of Our Children Get Out of the Church!* [26] The charge is raised in this

24) "Subject to the law or rule of another." *Stand. Dict.*

25) *Heraus aus der Kirche!*

26) *Um unserer Kinder willen heraus aus der Kirche!*

pamphlet that it is owing to the indifference of freethinkers that the state can make the assertion: Since 90 per cent. of the population of Germany belong to the Evangelical or to the Catholic Church, we have to give them some consideration. Professor Sackmann, speaking at a number of places, has said: "It is these very statistics that are false. Let us show by withdrawing from the Church *en masse* that we are the majority." Accordingly, it is quite an essential element of the new movement that children are withdrawn from the religious instruction which forms part of the curriculum of German state schools, and that secular schools are being founded. To obtain a school of this kind for Duesseldorf even the reckless means of a strike of the pupils was employed.

With these thoughts emanating from the natural sciences there are mingled in this movement for withdrawal from the Church *socialistic, proletarian* ideas. Prior to the war the principal slogan of the Socialist and proletarian elements in Germany was: The Church is aiding and abetting the capitalist and militarist class-state; it is the black police, and acts upon orders from the state to train the workmen to obedience and humility. Now that the Church has become independent of the State, this charge seems irrelevant, but the radical wing of the Socialists still makes this its principal charge against the Church, however, in a slightly modified form: Since the Majority Socialists have turned traitors to the revolution and by placing capitalism again on the throne have also restored the Church to her former position, the Church is again, just as previously, the main support of the capitalist classes and the strongest fortress of the opponents of the revolution. By teaching that every one must be subject to the powers that be the Church seeks to hinder the workmen in their struggle for a better existence. The pastors themselves belong to the capitalist class, and are prompted by the principle of solidarity, if by no other reason, to aid the capitalist system. In order to keep proletarians from resorting to self-help in the present world, the Church seeks to comfort them with prospects of a world to come. Children are crammed with Bible-passages and other worthless stuff, and the culture of the upper classes is withheld from them, to render them unfit for the struggle. This second line of thought has been fed mightily by the conduct of the Church during the war, and arguments based on the attitude of the Church during the war are wanting in no pamphlet, and in no campaign speech of the champions of the present movement for withdrawal from the

Church, not even if the champions do not belong to the proletarian party. Leading male and female pacifists take an active part in the agitation for withdrawal from the Church. It is being pointed out that the Church has blessed the arms used in the war, has agitated for the war, has cooperated with those who were prolonging the war,[27]) has negotiated war-loans, and made perseverance in the war the theme of its sermons, instead of planning for peace and aiding towards peace.

Sentiments regarding *Jesus* are divided. He is often mentioned with respect, and that, more frequently by proletarians than by Monists. The majority of the former pronounce Him the first communist, and review with envenomed hatred the entire history of the Church, the medieval *autos da fe,* the sins of the Popes, the conduct of Luther during the Peasants' War, and especially the agitation in behalf of the late war by modern theologians. By these means they seek to prove that the servants of Jesus have given the lie to His teachings, that the Church has amassed great wealth, and has not concerned itself about the poor. Among the Monists many declare that they have nothing to do with Jesus. Some follow Nietzsche, who pronounced the ethics of Jesus fit only for slaves; others hold with Naumann, who, in their view, has demonstrated that Jesus' ethics of serving love and His freedom from care are impossible in the modern world's struggle for existence and amidst our present conditions of labor; still others accept the findings of radical Bible criticism, which either denies absolutely that Jesus ever lived, or at any rate asserts that hardly any reliable knowledge of Him is available. *Drews* leads all the rest in a stubborn fight for the thesis which he has laid down in his book *The Christ Myth,*[28]) *viz.,* that modern theology commits a fundamental error by extolling the *man* Jesus and claiming at the same time that the primitive Christians attributed to this man only divine traits; while the contrary is true (according to Drews): the primeval myth of the dying and resurrected God-man, which was being circulated among the Jews even prior to the Christian era, has been made the source of the Christian religion by being foisted upon a man Jesus who never had an actual existence. Spite of his inward opposition to most freethinkers, Drews has again publicly entered the fight for withdrawal from the Church. In

27) the "Vaterlandspartei" (Party of the Fatherland).

28) *Die Christusmythe.*

Wuerttemberg he has been followed by *Bader,* the principal of a small, provisional teachers' seminary, who has published a brochure: *Facts, Thoughts, and Demands regarding Religious Instruction in the Schools, a Call to the Conscience of a Rigid, Untrue Church.*[29] In this brochure the findings of Drews's research are represented as scientific results, known well enough by theologians, but suppressed by them; for in their habitual untruthfulness they continue to preach their Jesuanism, instead of proclaiming in schools and churches faith in the eternal God-man, who is crucified in the world, that is, who passes through suffering, dies, and rises again in concrete form in any human being. This brochure is frequently recommended in periodicals for teachers. Dr. Lempp thinks it probable that the majority of the teachers will accept only the negative positions of the brochure, just as it is a matter of course with naturalists in the Alliance of Monists to decline the aforestated notion of the ever recurring God-man.

The views of *scientific Marxism* can be approximately stated to be as follows: Among the Jewish nation, which had been socially exploited, the Christian religion arose in a form agreeable to the prevailing stage of development, *viz.,* with a comforting prospect of happiness in the beyond[30] and with a sharp antagonism to mammonism. Because of the latter feature it was at first severely persecuted, but at a later period it was taken into the employ of the capitalist state, which ordered the priests to preach above all else the comforting prospect of happiness in the beyond, and to substitute contentment and obedience to the magistrates for antagonism to mammonism. At the present time, owing to economic evolution, Christianity is regarded as completely superannuated. The workman's savior is called Karl Marx.

Finally, many defects have, as a matter of course, been discovered in *the Church viewed as an institution,* such as unsocial arrangements, great wealth, over the administration of which nobody can exercise exact control, pastors who do not believe themselves what they preach to others, and who preach, because they are paid for doing so, etc. The Proletarian agitation loves particularly to operate with individual instances of unworthy pastors, and, of course, treats evangelical and Catholic clergyman alike.

---

29) *Tatsachen, Gedanken und Forderungen zum Schulreligionsunterricht, ein Ruf an das Gewissen einer starren, unwahren Kirche.*

30) "den Jenseitstrost."

IV. Means and Methods of Propaganda.

The methods adopted by agitators in the movement for withdrawal from the Church are well known. Their greatest attractions are *mass-meetings with good speakers.* Under the auspices of the Alliance of Monists its field secretary,[31] Dr. Aigner, a physician at Munich, and the speaker of the Alliance, Kahl of Hamburg, also Professors Gurlitt of Munich, Wahrmund of Prague, Drews of Karlsruhe, Verweyhen of Bonn, and others, are touring the country. The speakers for the Central Association of Proletarian Freethinkers throughout Germany are its President Menke, the editor of its organ, Beisswanger of Nuremburg, and others. Recently this Association has been advertising for the service of a field secretary and itinerant speaker. An efficient and cunning method of agitation has been adopted by the Monist Kahl: he exhibits beautiful stereopticon views of the solar system, of the evolution of the cosmos, of forms of Christian and non-Christian cults which resemble each other, and by this device attracts the masses. While showing his stereopticon views, he will talk for two hours in a fairly objective way. During the last quarter of an hour he draws what seem to be inevitable conclusions from his talk, *viz.*, that the Christian view of creation, the Christian faith in a final consummation, the unique character and independence of the Christian religion have been manifestly disproved. Kahl specially invites his opponents to these stereopticon lectures, but since he does not conclude his lectures until ten minutes before the police regulations for closing public entertainments go into effect, the time to reply to him is from the start reduced to five minutes, and in such a brief space it is impossible to discuss his arguments.

In Stuttgart *Professor Sackmann* delivers *Sunday addresses,* as substitutes for sermons, on such subjects as belief in God, belief in immortality, Monism and the formation of character, the present crisis in the conception of the world.[32] His object is to show that Monism offers positive values to the mind and a substitute for Christian edification. As a matter of fact these addresses, too, consist for the most part of polemics and criticism. Nothing else, of course, is to be expected, in view of the avowed principle of the Alliance of Freethinkers and Monists: the dissemination of a conception of the world that is based on modern knowledge and *declines all dogmas binding on the mind of man.*

31) Geschaeftsfuehrer.

32) "Weltanschauungskrise der Gegenwart."

To these measures must be added the regular meetings of the members of these societies, which are enlivened by addresses, debates, and musical entertainments. An attempt is being made in all cities to install *free-religious training of the young,* as a substitute for religious instruction. The very name "free-religious," which really expresses the tendencies only of the first of the organizations named in chapter I of this article, reveals the difficulty of the attempt. The training, in general, embraces three divisions: history of religion, biology, and contemplation of nature. As a rule, the item named last, *viz.,* scientific illuminism *à la* Haeckel, by means of natural history studies, is the leading part. The Alliance of Monists has published an offer of 1,000 marks for prize text-books, to be used in ethical instruction that is free from confessionalism and rests on a scientific basis. Gurlitt in Munich and the free-religious preacher at Frankfort have started free-religious teachers' seminaries. In general, there is complaint in the ranks of freethinkers regarding the inadequacy of the instruction imparted hitherto in the state schools, and the blame is placed on the lack of proper text-books and the insufficient training of the teachers. It goes without saying, however, that the main difficulty lies in the impossibility of offering a truly positive substitute for the Christian religion that is generally accepted among the freethinkers themselves.

An important means of propaganda is the *Jugendweihe* (consecration of youth), which terminates the instruction of the young people. It is an imitation of the Christian rite of confirmation, and in some part reproduces this rite down to the minutest details. The addresses delivered on the occasion regarding the true, the good, and the beautiful are anything rather than childlike. Worse than this, the poems, axioms, and mottoes, and a few citations from Goethe, Schiller, Heyse, Scheffel, Gottfried Keller, which the children recite are for the most part incredibly flat and a mere jingle of phrases. Still the impression made upon parents and children by these *Jugendweihen* is often great. On a grand scale the radical Socialists have taken up *work among the young people.* Besides organizing Social Democratic Young People's Societies, which have been split, like the Social Democratic Party itself, into three factions, and in which lectures on natural history and debates are a prominent feature, they are gradually establishing communistic Sunday-schools in every large city, they are conducting walking tours with the children for the purpose of nature study, etc. Fanat-

ical young workers, teachers, students, and others engage in this work with an enthusiastic devotion that could excite admiration. There is an earnest striving in many of these leaders to train the children to become really good, self-sacrificing men, filled with the love of nature and mankind. Actually, however, the strongest impression is invariably made upon the young people by inculcating upon them the fact that a great gulf has been fixed, by which the proletarian class is said to be divided from the Christian society among the bourgeoisie.

In all larger cities men (in most cases, teachers of the young) have been appointed to take the place of pastors at marriages and funerals.

As a rule, great skill is shown in the *pamphlets and brochures* that have been prepared chiefly by the Alliance of Monists, or its "Komitee Konfessionslos," and by the Central Association of Proletarian Freethinkers. Large editions of these publications have been disseminated, and the ideas sketched above have been presented in them in popular style. Quite recently pamphlets have been issued that call upon the people to serve notice on the authorities that their children will take no part in religious instruction at the schools. Blank forms for a notice of this kind are furnished gratis and delivered at the homes of the people. Dr. Zepler has even suggested that at the school exits pamphlets be distributed to the children in which they are to be warned against the humbug of religious instruction.

Naturally *agitation by word of mouth,* as it is carried on chiefly in factories, however, also by house-to-house canvass, is an important feature of the propaganda. A plain evidence of house-to-house canvassing was given at the withdrawals from the Church that took place in the court at Berlin: on some days during the previous year the street was choked, as before the show windows during the war, with persons who wanted to declare their withdrawal, and the records show that in some instances entire streets declared their withdrawal.

The propagandists for withdrawal build up their arguments not only from the war and the religious instruction of the state schools, but they add recently as a third feature of their agitation arguments based on the *church-tax.* The separation of Church and State provided by the new German constitution seems to be nominal; for in some states it has caused a church-tax to be imposed for the first time on such citizens as are church-members. In very

many localities a church-tax was levied for the first time on workmen who formerly had to pay only a small church-tax or none at all. This was caused by the enormous raise in wages. The levy of this tax afforded the agitators for withdrawal a most welcome theme for discussion. However, in discussing the tax they purposely spread false reports about exorbitant amounts that had to be paid for this tax, and their exaggerations had the desired effect. *E. g.,* in Wuerttemberg no agitation at mass-meetings or by means of pamphlets was as effective in inducing people to withdraw as a single false report about church-taxes that was spread among the workmen at the Daimler Works. At Halle, Hannover, Tangermuende there was on certain days a veritable flood of people rushing to the state office to declare their withdrawal from the Church. Dr. Lempp naively remarks: "The necessary increase of the church-tax, to which all state churches, I believe, are looking forward, superadded upon the growing misery of our nation, will most assuredly be followed by a material increase of withdrawals from the Church."

The Alliance of Monists has announced great plans for a still more vigorous propaganda. Congresses and meetings are to be held lasting a week, at which *Kultur* is to be discussed;[33] a central bureau of speakers is to be established; an academy of free thought is to be founded at Frankfort, for the training of Free Thought teachers and orators; Bruno Wille has issued a call for the organization of a German Kultur Party.

Dr. Lempp concludes his review as follows: "We see that we are face to face with an organized movement that must be taken seriously indeed, and that is going to inflict great damage on our Church and our entire nation in days to come. There is indeed no reason why we should lose courage; during the last two years our Evangelical Church has put to shame the prediction of all those who prophesied her ruin when once her state support would be withdrawn. It will be impossible to destroy our Church by this agitation for withdrawal, as long as the Gospel of Jesus Christ is alive in her. However, it is our duty to keep our eyes open and to defend our Church against her enemies to the best of our ability. Immediate measures of defense which we must adopt are public meetings and lectures and brochures, by which the arguments of our opponents are met. These measures are quite within our reach,

33) "Kulturwochen."

and experience teaches that they are efficient. The best measures of defense, however, will ever be indirect: faithful preaching and pastoral care, active charity, the strengthening of our sense of churchly domesticity and duty, and the creation of genuine congregational life. God grant that we may never grow weary of these tasks!"

Every sincere member of the Church will respect the above sentiments, and join the author in praying for their realization. It is, however, quite likely that ere long German churchmen will see that something else is required of them: true repentance of the wrongs of the past. The infidel propaganda which is now taking Germans by the thousands out of the churches operates with facts, and not only with fictions. The sins of the German state churches and of individual pastors in them are just as authentic as the sins of the Popes, and their psychological effect, too, is the same. Freethinkers, Monists, Socialists, *et id omne genus* could not score half their success, if the people were not convinced that these men have put their finger on real sores and blemishes in the body of the Church. It is the moiety of truth which they tell that does the real damage to the Church. In view of this it passes comprehension how men, otherwise enlightened and devout, can advocate the continuance of the old order, or view its abrogation with sorrow, alarm, and dismay, or retard the movement for the separation of Church and State in many ways. This feature in the present situation is to the outsider most disquieting. It would be rash to charge the German Church with having herself produced all the infidels, atheists, scoffers who are now heaping vile abuse and shame on her; but on the other hand it would be criminal leniency to exonerate the German Church from all blame for the existing state of affairs. German churchmen will not be fit for the real work of spiritual reconstruction, which is the plain program of the Church in Germany for the immediate future, until they have fully learned to know their former errors and malfeasances, and have begun to abhor and abominate them.

Churchmen in America should study with eager interest the sad evolution through which the German Church is passing; they may learn a salutary lesson from this study that will make them better judges of certain ominous movements in America.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Prof. Christian Keyser Preuss,

President of Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, died suddenly at 2 o'clock, Saturday morning, May 26. The deceased, prior to the Norwegian merger, maintained intimate relations with many friends in the Synodical Conference. The undersigned heard him last at the unveiling of the U. V. Koren monument near Decorah, and still remembers the ringing words which he spoke on that occasion. That he entered the Norwegian merger was learned with sad regret by his friends at the time. D.

Our Fathers Not So Much out of Date.

In the year 1871, at a meeting of our Western District, the question of advancing the standing of Synod's educational institutions came up for consideration. We cull from the minutes, p. 67: "Times have completely changed as to the demands made upon our ministry. . . . The doctrinal controversies waged with the sects are becoming more acute. To-day the mere claim that you have the Biblical doctrine will not suffice, — you must *prove* it. The Lutheran Church has awakened from her long sleep, has resurrected her old guns and turned them on the advocates of false doctrine. This has drawn fire from them. There are among them able gunners. . . . Without pastors who can dispel the sophistry of erudition — clouds of dust and mist — we cannot hope to prove victors; hence it is of the greatest importance to establish and maintain educational institutions of the highest standing. . . . If Luther had not been so learned a man and had not, by profound study, acquired a preeminent faculty for mature judgment, he could never have been the reformer of the Church. This he himself admits, stating that his faith would, without learning, have saved him from the devil, but without scholarship and the pen he could not have stood his ground, yea, vanquished his foes.

"An unlearned pastor can indeed guide his flock on the way to life, but he is not fitted to contend with scholarly opponents. Unless our Lutheran Church will do all within her power, not only to maintain her institutions of higher learning, but to advance their standing in every way, she cannot hope to hold her own, not to speak of gaining ground. And in contending for the truth a knowledge of the original Biblical languages is essential. At Pentecost the Holy Spirit bestowed the knowledge of languages in a brief time; *now* we must acquire that knowledge laboriously, but it is just as necessary to-day.

"Pastors must have a mind well schooled and excellently drilled, so that they can lay bare the most occult sophistries to the vision of the simplest Christian. And we must have efficient schools to produce men of that caliber. . . .

"The more colleges we have, the more of our young people we can hope to gain for them. We are continually lamenting the dearth

of proper men for our political or state offices. This could be remedied by properly educating young people of our faith and mind, and fitting them to fill even the most important public positions with credit and blessing." (Contrib.) PROF. A. W. MEYER, Winfield, Kans.

Evolutionism = Infidelity.

Dr. L. S. Keyser goes on record (*Luth. Church Herald,* May 31) as claiming that an evolutionist who is a believer in the Scriptures is an extremely rare bird, in fact, he can be a believer only by a happy inconsistency; for evolution, rightly understood, is spontaneous development by inherent force. It is the denial of any force working upon matter from without, and necessarily rejects creation and miracle. "The destructive critics of the Bible are practically all professed believers in evolution. . . . Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen tore the Bible to pieces and tried to reconstruct its history solely because, as the good Book stands, it would not fit into their preconceived evolutionistic views. According to Dr. Geo. Henslowe's *Present-day Rationalism Critically Examined* the infidelity (called 'rationalism' and 'secularism' and 'materialistic monism') of Great Britain is 'professedly based on Darwinism.' And it is perhaps the most outspoken, brazen, and best organized infidelity in the world, having all the facilities for successful propaganda. Dr. Griffith Jones, of England, an advocate of evolution, refuses to accept the Bible at its face value, and remands most of its history to the realm of myth, legend, and folklore. In this country Prof. Leuba, a pronounced atheist, avows his belief in evolution." In Germany "the arch materialist Ernest Haeckel accepted the hypothesis of Darwin, and made it the basis of his crass views, even declaring that it was the duty of science to rid the world of its two crowning errors, belief in God and immortality. . . . Nietzsche . . . declared himself an adherent of Darwinism. . . . He died in an insane asylum! Read the pathetic story of his erratic career in Canon Henry Lewis' informing book *Modern Rationalism as Seen at Work in its Biographies* (published in London, 1913). . . . Camille Flammarion . . . everywhere in his book (*Death and Mystery*) rejects the solution of the problem of the future by the Christian religion, scoffing at it again and again. But . . . on page 25 he has this to say: 'Universal ignorance is the law of our mundane humanity from the days of its simian birth.' Page 28, referring to Auguste Comte: 'It was difficult to look at him without thinking of our simian origin. . . . Prof. James B. Pratt (in *Religious Consciousness: a Psychological Study*) . . . tries to account for religious experience in every way but the right way . . . and to discredit every real Christian experience by calling it the 'conventional' type. . . . But . . . on page 24, where he is speaking of the instinct of curiosity, he says: 'It is, in fact, one of the instincts of the race, inherited from our brute ancestors.' " Yes, scratch an evolutionist and discover an atheist. The facts in the case are such that any one professing evolutionism must show cause why we should not consider him an infidel. The *onus probandi* is on him. The case is similar to that of

being a Christian and a Freemason. The possibility of one individual being both rests on an inconsistency, but even as an inconsistency it is rare. It is more likely that the assumed form of Christianity is a hypocritical sham. At any rate, a genuine Christian is in bad company among evolutionists and Freemasons, and is horrified when he realizes the infidel character of his associations. D.

U. L. C. in Argentina.

The Board of Foreign Missions of the Merger synods has appointed Dr. Chas. L. Fry its special representative for Argentina, S. A. The missionaries of the Board in Argentina are Dr. E. H. Mueller and wife, and Mrs. Anna H. Mueller. A permanent abode for the mission is to be secured at once, and the work in the Argentine field is to be pushed vigorously by stereopticon lectures which the new representative proposes to deliver throughout the U. L. C. D.

Lutheran Foreign Missions.

George Drach, in the *Lutheran* (June 2), presents the following survey: —

Board.	Fields.	*Missionaries.*	*Christians.*	*Income 1920.*	*Average per Conf. Member.*
United Lutheran	India, Japan, Liberia, British Guiana, Argentina	152	92,600	$575,722	$ .73
Norwegian Church	China, Madagascar, South Africa	135	14,184	352,481	1.35
Missouri	India, China	31	2,631	*95,000	.15
Augustana	China	41	1,100	93,085	.46
Joint Ohio	India	8	†3,000	*45,000	.30
Iowa	New Guinea	43	6,024	†40,000	.30

* Budget for 1921. † Estimate.

"The Augustana Synod, in addition to its China Mission, furnishes missionaries and money for the mission-work of the United Lutheran Church, and the United Danish and Icelandic Synods do likewise." D.

An Open Letter on Freemasonry to President Harding.

In "An Open Letter to His Excellency, Warren G. Harding, President of the United States," published in the April number of the *Christian Cynosure,* S. C. Kimball says very strikingly and truly: —

"You may ask why I did not address you privately instead of in an open letter. The reason is because my letter relates to Freemasonry. I am informed that your private secretary is a Freemason, and if that be so, my lifelong experience leads me to fear that my letter would go into the wastebasket instead of to your desk.

"It was a sublime spectacle when you laid your right hand on Micah 6, 8 and said: 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God? This I plight to God and country.'

"The papers affirm, and your public acts seem to confirm, the fact that you are what is commonly called a high Mason. I wish it were all a slander, but I have not a single well-attested fact to lend support to such a hope.

"You publicly and solemnly swore 'to do justly,' but if you have taken the secret oaths of Masonry, you have done injustice to your own Christian conscience, to your noble public record, to nine-tenths of your fellow-countrymen, whom all standard Masonic literature insultingly stigmatize as dogs, *cowans* (in Greek *kyan*).

"You publicly swore 'to love mercy.' Is it mercy to a self-respecting man to be initiated in due form in Ancient Craft Masonry? You may say: I was not subjected to those unspeakable indignities. Most likely, but that makes it all the worse, as you become the decoy duck of our country in rejecting Jesus Christ and worshiping Baal Peor, the god of Masonry.

"How can you love mercy and swear under the most horrid penalties to discriminate against all outside the Masonic Lodge? How can you walk humbly with God and in secret swear to uphold a system, the cardinal principle of which is that the Bible is on a level with the sacred books of all heathen religions? Did you walk humbly with God when you swore to uphold a system that purposely ignores Jesus Christ in its lower degrees and mocks Him with worse than pagan rites in its so-called higher degrees? Did you walk humbly with God when you assented to a religion that teaches regeneration by the coarse buffoonery of a secret lodge, instead of a new birth from heaven by the blessed Holy Spirit, and that mocks the resurrection of the dead by the raising of fabled Hiram Abiff by a secret lodge grip? By what use of words can a man swear to walk humbly with God, and at the same time in secret swear to uphold a system of worship that fundamentally rejects Jesus Christ and places every pagan religion on a level with Christianity?

"President Washington when a young man took some of the lower degrees of Masonry, but when he became a public servant, he practically abandoned Masonry and declared it was not agreeable to him to be addressed as a Freemason. The humblest citizen has a right to demand that the President shall set a good example. Membership in the Masonic lodge is inconsistent with the duties of the presidential office. The President is in duty bound to defend the equal rights of every citizen. The Freemason is sworn to show partiality in favor of a brother Mason.

"Moreover, the principles of Freemasonry are immoral. The prudent limits of this letter forbid me to give detailed proofs of this. Daniel Webster, one of the ablest lawyers our country has produced, declared that Masonic oaths should be prohibited by law. President John Quincy Adams said he could demonstrate that the oaths of Freemasonry were inconsistent with morality and the Christian religion. Your distinguished Baptist brother, Rev. Dr. Nathaniel Clover, of Boston, when taking the Royal Arch degree, came to the oath requiring him to support a brother Mason, 'right or wrong,' and

said: 'Gentlemen, I cannot take that oath.' He left the lodge and was a lifelong anti-Mason. The great evangelists David Nelson and Charles G. Finney were Freemasons, but when converted left Masonry with their other sins.

"You may brush aside my criticism as not worth your notice, but can you ignore the reasoning of Chief Justice John Marshall, Gerrit Smith, Thurlow Weed, Joseph Cook, and William H. Seward on the subject of Freemasonry? Does the withdrawal of a multitude of godly men from the Masonic lodge for conscience' sake not move you to repentance? Is it not worth your notice that Christian churches numbering millions of members peremptorily refuse admission to Freemasons on moral grounds? If a man is right, he can afford to stand alone against the world, but is it wise for a Christian man to defy the moral sentiment of mankind in support of a demonstrated evil?

"In discussing the merits of the League of Nations you offered an unanswerable objection that it would *bind* the United States *to do things the nature of which was entirely unknown.* Your declaration of that sound principle did much to keep us out of the League and to make you President. Please apply that logic to the man who in one night swears to obey the horrid oaths of thirty degrees of Freemasonry of which he is supposed to be wholly ignorant. The sad example of Jephthah and of blood-guilty, drunken Herod should warn us not to swear to do things purposely concealed from us.

"When you took your oath of office with your right hand on Micah 6, 8, it was equally on Lev. 5, 4, which declares it to be a sin to swear to do a thing hidden from us. Even if it were not positively forbidden in the Bible, common sense would teach us the sin of swearing to do an unknown thing. I sympathize most heartily with you in the deplorable situation into which you have been decoyed. The excitement of the banquet-hall, the flattery of admirers, the charm of exquisite music, and the generous 'dispensations' of the fraternity, all tended to throw you off your guard.

"The oaths of Freemasonry are like a fish-hook in the flesh. Escape is difficult, but not impossible. Satan can forge no bands that Jesus Christ cannot break. The oaths of Masonry disqualify a man for holding public office. They tend to paralyze our laws and to corrupt our courts and legislatures. The Freemasons kidnapped and murdered William Morgan, a veteran soldier and worthy citizen of New York, and successfully defied the laws of that great State so far as to shield those murderers from just punishment. That Freemasons shield their lawless comrades and defy successfully the laws of the land is too well known to require proof. Their oaths compel them to break the laws of God and man.

"I know, Mr. President, you are very busy just now, and can hardly afford in week-day time to investigate the oaths of Freemasonry which you are accused of having taken in a lump, but I suggest that you purchase of the National Christian Association, 850 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., an authentic copy of Masonic

oaths and employ your Sunday leisure hours in carefully reading them. As one of your supporters and admirers, I am not willing that your honored name should go down in history stained with such abominable oaths. Millions of your countrymen are daily praying that the blessing of Heaven may rest on your administration, and that you may be counted worthy to be ranked with Washington, Lincoln, and Grant." Surely, an excellent summary of the evils of Freemasonry, and an appeal, which because of its very objectivity, and the kindly sympathy that breathes through the entire letter, is worthy of close study. MUELLER.

"Respect for Authority."

America, a Roman Catholic weekly, says in its issue of April 16, 1921: "As for Protestantism, it is, as its name implies, a protest, a negative. And a negative is nothing. Its very basis is the right of private judgment and the right of any one member to protest against the individual or collective judgment or opinion or belief of his fellows. A first principle of religion is respect for authority, and the first principle of Protestantism denying authority has long since accomplished the ruin of itself, and as it struggles in a death agony, Samson-like, it pulls down the ruin of the structure to crush its followers."

"Respect for authority!" Yes, but the right authority. In the first of his Ninety-five Theses Luther says that "our Lord and Master Jesus Christ" is the authority whom men should respect. In the place of this authority the Roman Catholic Church puts its "infallible" Pope, and modern Protestantism "Dame Reason," and thus *both* are accomplishing their ruin.

Over against the *sola Roma* and the *sola ratio* Lutheranism puts the *sola Scriptura, sola gratia, sola fides.* Private judgment and private interpretation are not identical terms. FRITZ.

When a Man Is a President.

1.

The White House,
Washington. March 29, 1921.

MY DEAR MR. GOLD: —

On the occasion of the four-hundredth celebration of Luther's stand before the Diet of Worms, I think there will be general agreement that Luther's firm advocacy of unfettered opinion deserves commemoration as one of the notable contributions towards mankind's intellectual emancipation. Its fitting celebration will be a testimony to the fact that the world has, since his time, traveled far on the way to realizing his ideal of full individual liberty.

Very truly yours,
(Signed.) WARREN G. HARDING.

To Rev. Howard R. Gold,
Secretary National Lutheran Council.

(*Lutheran Church Herald.*)

2.

The Catholic World (May, 1921).

"The President of the United States not only sent his personal representative to the funeral mass at Baltimore, but as soon as he received the news of the Cardinal's death, wrote this appreciation [italics our own]: —

"In common with *all our people* I mourn the death of Cardinal Gibbons. His long and notable *service to country* and to Church makes us all *his debtors.* He was ever ready to lend his encouragement to any movement for the betterment of his fellow-men. He was the *very finest type of citizen* and churchman. It was my good fortune to know him personally, and I held him in the highest esteem and veneration. His death is *a distinct loss to the country,* but it brings to fuller appreciation a great and admirable life. . . ."

Which reminds us of the fact that this man Gibbons wrote something about the *Faith of Our Fathers* and several other things, which, if carried into execution, would not have been of remarkable service to our Republic. At any rate, Gibbons did not travel very far on the way towards realizing Luther's ideal of full individual liberty.

MUELLER.

New Zealand and the Decree "Ne Temere."

The *Converted Catholic* (March, 1921) offers the following bit of news, which may be of more than passing interest: —

"Our readers will doubtless remember the recommendation of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council of New Zealand respecting mixed marriages and the Pope's *Ne Temere* Decree," says the *English Churchman* (November 11, 1920). "It was, in effect, that any one who would impugn the validity of marriages contracted according to the law of the land, or would stigmatize the issue of such marriages as illegitimate, should be liable to a fine of £100 or a year's imprisonment. The recommendation of the committee has been adopted by the House of Representatives and has now become law. In declaring that the decree of the Pope must not override the authority of the state, New Zealand has set an example which the mother country would do well to follow." The *Converted Catholic* adds the following comment: "Also the Federal Government of the United States, say we"; and closes the matter with "A Jesuit's View" on the recommendation, as set forth in *The Month* (October, 1920), from which we cite in part: —

"Now their aim is clearly to penalize the holding of the Catholic faith in regard to marriage. If their meaning only is that no one should question the civil effects of civil-law marriage, they are uttering useless words; no one does dispute the power of the state to determine the legal effects of the marriage contract. But to claim that the state should determine what is and what is not the Sacrament of Matrimony and what makes it valid in the sight of God — that is the rankest Caesarism to which no Christian can submit. Catholics will

regard such a view as *ultra vires,* and treat it as a dead letter, just as they now treat the religious import of divorce decrees." — Having caught both the point and the logic of the "View," the dazed reader is certainly entitled to the old, old question: Why is a Jesuit?

MUELLER.

Our "Christian Nation."

"The difficulty to-day is that the multitudes are no longer attending the churches. They are seeking after pleasure. The automobile, the golf-links, the baseball games, the moving-picture shows have come in between the multitudes and the Church. This is very serious for America. — There are 27,000,000 of Protestant youths under the age of 20 in America to-day who are receiving no religious instruction" (some people believe that "Protestant" is derived from "protest," in the sense of "object" — ED.), "and there are 58,000,000 of people in the United States to-day who have no Church affiliation, neither Protestant, Catholic, nor Jewish." (Judge Wells, of New Jersey, quoted in the *Lutheran,* June 2.) That makes a partial crop of 85,000,000 irreligionists. But Justice Brewer said that ours is a Christian nation, and he was Judge of our Supreme Court, which is, of course, more than being just an ordinary judge in New Jersey. The most humiliating feature about this piece of statistics, which every hundred-per-cent. American is in duty bound to denounce as flagrantly unpatriotic, is that it comes after we have, with so much Christian fervor, passed the XVIII Amendment and the Volstead Act, and have immensely raised the moral character of our politics and public life by decreeing Woman Suffrage. It seems the better we become, the worse we get — just like the Pharisees of old. But perish the parallel! D.

BOOK REVIEW.

Eunice. *C. M. Zorn.* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 98 pp., 5×7½. $1.00, postpaid. Special prices to colporteurs.

This book is an adaptation from the German by the author's son, the Rev. H. M. Zorn, and is denominated in its subtitle as "Letters of a Fatherly Friend to a Young Christian Mother." There are twenty-three letters in all, and the general topic is the relation of a Christian mother to her children. The first letter addresses the young mother; counsel is given on many questions relating to her child as it develops from year to year, the last letter treating the mother's attitude over against her child's betrothal. Dr. Zorn in these letters handles many difficult subjects with literary skill, practical wisdom, and Christian scholarship. GRAEBNER.

Statistical Year-Book of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1920. 173 pages; 75 cts.

The carefully elaborated tabulations in this book render it indispensable for any one who wishes to observe how Christian church-life works out in the Missouri Lutheran Synod. The present annual contains valuable new features, such as the map of parishes on p. 120, and the language table on p. 121. D.

Die Psalmen. Der Himmelspilger Kost und Rueste. Dem Christenvolke dargeboten von *C. M. Zorn.* 755 pages. $4.00. (Verlag des Schriftenvereins [E. Klaerner], Zwickau, Sachsen.)

The half year which Christians who love a nervous style that arrests attention will spend in daily meditations on these practical, soulful expositions of the Psalms in German will be a continuous spiritual banquet. From the devotional view-point this book is the best that the author's prolific pen has produced. It offers an abundance of varied food, well prepared. D.

The Religious Consciousness. A Psychological Study by *James Bissett Pratt, Ph. D.* New York, the MacMillan Co., 1920. 500 pp., 5½×8½. $4.00.

Dr. Pratt, professor of intellectual and moral philosophy in Williams College, in this volume deposits the result of many years of research into the psychological side of religion. His treatment of the subject is strictly modern in the sense that he deals with religion as a purely natural phenomenon in human life. It represents the natural, or biological view of religion. Religion and religious experience are considered the result of entirely explicable psychical forces. Religion is recognized only as a natural property of man; supernatural religion is ignored. "Modern religious psychology would reduce all the varied expression of religion, whether Christian or pagan, to biology, that is to say, to commonly prevalent instincts and impulses. But strange as it may appear, the radical liberalistic psychology of religion denies that there is a distinct religious instinct; it denies that there is a personal God. In other words, it disavows the genuineness of religion." (Horsch, *Modern Religious Liberalism.*)

This attitude cannot fail to vitiate the presentation of the subject in every detail. Dr. Pratt defines religion as follows: "Religion is the serious and social attitude of individuals or communities toward the power or powers which they conceive as having ultimate control over their interests and destinies." (p. 2.) Note that at the very outset, the subjective side of religion — "an attitude" — is stressed to the exclusion of the objective, its validity, which is throughout the book treated as an open question. Whenever this problem obtrudes itself, it is waved aside as non-germane to the general subject. As when on page 335 the question whether prayer is nothing more than a mind state, or whether there is an objective relation between the soul and "some sort of 'Higher Power,'" is dismissed with the remark that "this is for metaphysics rather than for psychology." Of course, Dr. Pratt admits that "if the subjective value of prayer be all the value it has, we wise psychologists of religion had best keep the fact to ourselves; otherwise the game will soon be up, and we shall have no religion left to psychologize about" (p. 336)—!

While the author does not enter upon the validity of religious experience, a few intimations which he gives may be of interest: "The psychologist of religion must remember that explanation through the Supernatural, though quite possibly true, is not psychology." (p. 63.) "A superhuman source of revelation, though something in which the philosopher may well believe, is not something which the man of science can ever

verify." (p. 63.) This, obviously, is reasoning in a circle, since the "man of science" is evidently presumed to be a man who accepts no testimony for the miraculous element of the Christian religion, for prophecy, for Christ's resurrection, nor for the miraculous effects of the Gospel on human character. As for deriving all our religious life from One personality, — as do those who believe that Christ is the Vine and they the branches, — Prof. Pratt suggests that "religion is as many-sided and inclusive as life. When we come to this realization, how pitifully narrow and unaccountably blind seem the various attempts that are always being made by enthusiastic and scholarly doctrinaires to deduce the whole of religion from some single human influence" (p. 121)! The utmost that Prof. Pratt will grant the modern man in the way of a reasonable religion is stated on page 308: "There is one kind of worship that is perfectly objective and sincere, and that is quite as possible for the intelligent man of to-day as it was for the ancient: — namely, that union of awe and gratitude which is reverence, combined perhaps with consecration and a suggestion of communion which most thoughtful men must feel in the presence of the Cosmic forces and in reflecting upon them." This, of course, is a religion which a Monist and even an atheist will readily subscribe to.

On its scientific side, Dr. Pratt's book is less satisfying even, if that were possible, than on its religious. Beyond the idea that religion is simply a biological phenomenon, like sensation or even digestion, his book sets forth no unifying principle for the classification of religious experiences. No scientific classification is attempted. Nor is the "Religious Consciousness" treated psychologically, but only states of consciousness, and these according to an artificial classification of data, as is revealed by a glance at the table of contents and many times confirmed by a reading of the book. That it will do damage where young students draw from it their views on matters religious cannot be doubted. It is a typical presentation of radical unbelief as taught in the college of to-day. That any one can obtain from this piecemeal study of religious phenomena a truly comprehensive view of religion as an object of study, is, of course, out of the question. To the careful reader, the agnostic attitude has again proven itself the enemy not only of Christian faith, but also of the scientific treatment of religion as a phenomenon of mind. GRAEBNER.

Q. E. D., or New Light on the Doctrine of Creation. *George McCready Price.* Fleming H. Revell and Co. 144 pp., 5×7½. $1.00.

In non-professional terminology the author, who is professor of geology in Pacific Union College, Lodi, California, discusses the various problems which enter into the evolutionary view of origins. He marshals the most recent discoveries in radioactivity, in energetics, in histology, and in Mendelism, making out a formal Q. E. D. for the old-time doctrine of a real Creation, as recorded in Genesis, without any minimizing or qualifications whatever. He shows, in the concluding chapter, that the prophecy of Peter, 2 Pet. 3, 3—7, has an accurate fulfilment in the religio-scientific theories of these "last days," and of the characteristic methods of reasoning employed in the presentation of the modern popular doctrines of the evolutionists. GRAEBNER.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by *James Hastings*. With the assistance of *John A. Selbie, M. A., D. D.*, and *Louis H. Gray, M. A., Ph. D.* Vol. XI: Sacrifice — Sudra. 916 pages. $8.00. (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York City.)

To save space for what our readers will most likely regard as essential to their interests, this account must omit all references to articles dealing with the religion, ethnography, and geography of the peoples of India, China, the American aborigines, and with Mohammedanism. It is necessary, first, to obtain some conception of the range of subjects treated in this volume. The articles of outstanding importance are, as in the preceding volumes, of composite authorship. There are twelve of these: Sacrifice (40 pages, 10 contributors), Saints and Martyrs (34 and 11), Salvation (42 and 9), Scapegoat (4½ and 2), Secret Societies (among pagans and rude peoples; 20 and 4), Sects (38½ and 8), Serpent Worship (24 and 3), Sin (42 and 15), Slavery (35½ and 6), Soul (30 and 10), State of the Dead (37 and 11), Stones (12 and 4). — Contributions in which the element of Christian doctrine predominates are offered on Sacrilege, by J. S. Reid; Sanctification, by R. H. Coats; Satisfaction, by R. S. Franks; Schism, by H. W. Fulford; Seven Deadly Sins and Seven Virtues, by A. B. D. Alexander; Shame, by E. S. Ames; Shekinah, by J. J. Price; Shewbread, by W. H. Bennett; Slander, by J. M. V. Hope; Sobriety, by R. L. Ohley; Sodomy, by G. A. Barton; Soteriology, by T. B. Kilpatrick (this single article of 30 pages is the best of any of the dogmatic synopses in this book); Divine Sovereignty, by A. E. Garvie; Holy Spirit, by B. B. Hoyle; Spirituality, by D. Fyffe. — Historical aspects of the Christian religion, and movements that have appreciably affected the life and work of the Christian Church, are presented in the following articles: Sadducees, by G. H. Box; Latter-day Saints, by I. W. Riley; Salvation Army, by W. B. Booth; Samaritans, by W. J. Moulton; Samosatenism, by H. J. Lawlor; Sanhedrin, by I. Abrahams; Satanism, by E. S. Hartland; Skeptics, by J. Burnet; Skepticism, by L. de la Vallee Pussin; Scholasticism, by S. H. Mellone; Scribes, by J. Moffat; Second Adventism, by S. J. Case; Secularism, by E. S. Waterhouse; Seekers, by R. M. Jones; Semi-Arianism, by F. J. F. Jackson; Semites, by G. A. Barton; Simony, by A. J. Maclean; Slavs, by M. A. Czaplicka; Socialism, by S. A. Mellor; Societas Perfecta, by J. N. Figgis; Socinianism, by W. M. Clow; Solemn League and Covenant, by A. Lawson; Sophists, by R. D. Hicks; Southcottians, by W. T. Whitney; Speronistae, by J. B. Mullinger; Spiritism and Spiritualism, by F. C. S. Schiller; Sponsors, by G. H. S. Walpole; Stations, by A. J. Maclean; Stedingers, by H. B. Workman; Stigmata, by H. Cowan; Christian Student Movement, by N. S. Talbot and H. Martin; Sublapsarianism, by James Orr; Subordination, by H. D. A. Major. — Very informing and critical biographical articles are offered on Savonarola, by E. G. Gardiner; Schleiermacher, by W. B. Selbie; Schopenhauer, by E. S. Haldane; Seadiah, by H. Malter; Seneca, by A. C. Pearson; Shammai, by J. Abelson; Henry Sidgwick, by E. E. C. Jones; Simon Magus, by G. N. L. Hall; Socrates, by J. Burnet; Sophocles, by L. Campbell; Herbert Spencer, by H. Elliot; and Spinoza, by E. E. Kellett. — Philosophic concepts, psychological phe-

nomena, sociological questions are treated in articles on Science, by J. A. Thompson, Scottish Philosophy, by W. L. Davidson; Sensationalism, by T. Rees; Sense and Sensibility, by J. A. Hyslop; Sex, by R. C. Punnett; Sociology, by L. T. Hobhouse; Solidarity, by E. Ehrhardt; Solipsism, by R. F. A. Hoernlé; Space, by G. J. Stokes; Spontaneity, by J. H. Hyslop; State (political), by C. D. Burns; Stoics, by E. V. Arnold; Subconsciousness, by J. L. McIntyre; Subjectivism and Subjectivity, by W. B. Selbie; Substance, by J. Lindsay; and in the group of articles by eleven different authors that involve the concept of self (self-assertion and self-subjection, self-consciousness, self-culture and self-discipline, self-expression, self-love, self-preservation, self-realization, self-respect, self-righteousness, self-sacrifice, self-satisfaction). — Ethical and religious view-points are exhibited even in such seemingly trivial subjects as Saliva, Salutations, Ships and Boats, Shoes and Sandals, Skin, Sky and Sky Gods, Smoking, Staff, Stone Monuments, Storm and Storm Gods, Strangers, etc. How social and economic evolutions affect religion and ethics can be seen, *e. g.*, in the articles Settlements, Strikes, and Struggle for Existence. Of course, the mere enumeration of a series of articles and authors will mean very little to the average reader, but it will aid the student who observes from this scheme both what has been embodied in, and what has been omitted from, this encyclopedia, to understand somewhat the guiding principle, the scope, and the intended emphases of the editors. — The dominant spirit throughout the volumes of the E R E that have been published so far has been that of exhaustive historical research by what our age is pleased to call scientific. The present volume is no exception to the rule. There is a vast amount of information collected for it and conveniently classified which no other work offers. The evident aim of the compilers and editors has been to present in a comprehensive survey all that is known on a given subject. References are carefully given, to enable the student to test the validity of statements and to carry on further research. The value-judgments and findings of the author not infrequently betray skepticism, and even though they are put forward in a tentative way, are unfavorable to belief in the positive truths of Bible Christianity. To give an example, E. O. James says on primitive sacrifice: "Hitherto the institution had been usually regarded as of divine appointment, since from Gen. 4, 3—5 and Heb. 11, 4 it appears that the divine authority sanctioned Abel's offering, and considered it, by faith, more acceptable than that of Cain. It need not, however, follow on theological grounds that the ordinance is of divine origin because it is said by faith Abel's offering to Jahweh was a more excellent sacrifice than that of Cain. For the Jahwistic writer treats sacrifice as a natural institution, an instinctive mode of worship, while the priestly creation-document ignores the existence of the rite altogether. But such a theory of the origin of sacrifice hardly harmonizes with the present tendency of historical theology or of the science of religions. To-day the divine origin of religious institutions is sought in the ever-developing minds of men rather than in sacred tradition." T. B. Kilpatrick writes on the Christian view of Salvation: "This article does not intrude into the domain of exegetical or doctrinal theology. It attempts to follow, through the history of Israel and through the period covered by the New Testament, the

experience of salvation. The point of view from which it has been written, as well as the conclusion which it seeks to establish, is the unity and continuity of the experience, as well as its vital and growing quality. . . . The fact presented to our view in the synoptic gospels is a religious experience, possessed by a group of persons, gathered round the central figure of Jesus of Nazareth. In seeking to realize what that experience was, all the difficulties beset us which belong to the problem of life. If Christianity were a mosaic of ideas and practises, the work of understanding it, though toilsome, would be comparatively simple. But Christianity is, primarily and ultimately, life; and to penetrate to its secret needs more than tabulation and classification of details. This, at least, is true, that life begets life. There were religious life and experience in Israel before Jesus gathered His disciples about Him. It is certain that neither to His consciousness nor to theirs did the life and experience which they possessed present themselves as marking a breach with the past. They did rejoice in what they regarded as development, or even transition, into a new religion of saving powers. But they would have rejected with horror the suggestion that they were founding a new religion, or were abandoning the highway of salvation, trodden by patriot and martyr, saint and seer, of Israel's lineage. . . . The experience was intensely individual. — It is difficult to remember, when reading the synoptic gospels, that we are watching the beginning of a great world movement, which gave rise, in its development, to vast intellectual systems and huge ecclesiastical apparatus. In these stories we seem to be concerned only with a man among other men. And, indeed, this is precisely where the point of interest does lie. Let apocalyptic revelation lie over. Let Christology wait. Meantime, see what one Man made of other men. The beginning of Christianity was not a 'mass movement.' It was personal contact of individuals with Jesus and, later, of individuals with other single souls. The gospels are largely made up of 'cases.'" Thus the presentation goes on for pages; it is salvation, as we are wont to study it in soteriology, the individual appropriation of Christ by the believer. Ultimately, Jesus emerges in this presentation as the crucified Redeemer, and the message of salvation is the Word of the cross. But the element from which Jesus saves, sin and guilt, should be much more forcibly brought out; the vicarious satisfaction of Christ as the basis of the life which the author declares Christianity to be is not presented, and the text which exhibits every element of the author's definition of salvation, Gal. 2, 20 ("The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me"), has not been exhausted for the author's treatment of his subject, as it should have been. We regret that we have to forego further mention of details. — 170 scholars have made contributions to this volume; of these 126 are British, 27 American, 5 French, 3 German, 2 each, Canadian and Esthonian, 1 each, Dutch, Belgian, Hindu, Italian, and Japanese. The work is of thoroughly British scholarship, or some will likely say, Anglo-Saxon scholarship, to include the Americans. The foreign contributors are a mere garnishing for this intellectual feast. Two women are among the contributors, six Jews, and one Lutheran, Dr. Youngert of Augustana Seminary, Rock Island.

D.